

KL



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,580	01/23/2001	John F. McMahon	42390.P5142D	3565

7590 04/03/2002

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
Seventh Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

CHAMBLISS, ALONZO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/768,580

Applicant(s)

MCMAHON, JOHN F.

Examiner

Alonzo Chambliss

Art Unit

2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 1/23/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The amendment B filed 1/11/02 has been fully considered and made of record in Paper No. 6.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 1/11/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges that Kiyoshi fails to teach placing a first chip package on a first shelf and electrically attaching the first chip package to a plurality of shelves. This argument is respectfully deemed to be unpersuasive because Kiyoshi teaches placing a first chip package 4 on a first shelf, which is electrically attached to a plurality of shelves, since the plurality of shelves are electrically attached to pin 1 (see Fig. 1). Pin 1 electrically attaches the multi-chip package to an external device, which means that the plurality of shelves are in electrical communication with each other by way pins 1 resulting in the first chip package 4 being also in electrical communication with the plurality of shelves. Therefore, this action is made **final**.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:  
52. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiyoshi (JP 4-219966).

With respect to Claim 21, Kiyoshi teaches placing a first chip package 4 on a first shelf, which is electrically attached to a plurality of shelves, since the plurality of shelves are electrically attached to pin 1 (see Fig. 1). Pin 1 electrically attaches the multi-chip package to an external device, which means that the plurality of shelves are in electrical communication with each other by way pins 1 resulting in the first chip package 4 being also in electrical communication with the plurality of shelves. A second chip package 4 (i.e. the chip above the first chip package) is electrically attached to the second shelf (see English abstract and figures).

With respect to Claim 26, the first chip package 4 is wire bonded to the plurality of shelves through pins 1 (see Fig. 1).

With respect to Claim 27, the second chip package 4 is wire bonded to the plurality of shelves by pins 1 (see Fig. 1).

6. Claims 21, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hsu (U.S. 5,633,530).

With respect to Claim 21, Hsu places a first chip package 13a on a first shelf, which is electrically attached to the plurality of shelves, since the plurality of shelves are electrically attached to pin 20. Pin 20 electrically attaches the multi-chip package to an external device, which means that the plurality of shelves are in electrical communication with each other by way pins 20 resulting in the first chip package 13a being also in electrical communication with the plurality of shelves.. A second chip package 13b is electrically attached to the second shelf (see Fig.1).

With respect to Claim 26, the first chip package 13a is wire bonded to the plurality of shelves by pins 20 (see Fig. 1).

With respect to Claim 27, the second chip package 13b is wire bonded to the plurality of shelves by pins 20 (see Fig. 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patent ability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu (U.S. 5,633,530) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Chia et al. (U.S. 5,563,446).

Hsu disclose covering the package above the second chip package with a lid 16b (see Fig. 1). Hsu fails to disclose filling the package above the second chip package with an encapsulant. However, with respect to Claims 22 and 23, Chia discloses filling

the package above a chip with an encapsulant 188 or a lid 288. The encapsulant when added to the package taught by Hsu would seal the open cavity below the second shelf to protect the first chip package. Therefore, it would be obvious to use the encapsulant with Hsu since the encapsulant would protect the die and its wire bond leads from outside contamination as taught by Chia.

9. Claim 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsu (U.S. 5,633,530) as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Wenzel et al. (U.S. 6,150,724).

Hsu discloses two semiconductor chips one above the other (see Fig. 1). Hsu fails to disclose a CPU chip package on the first shelf and a memory cache on the second shelf. However, with respect to Claim 24 and 25, Wenzel discloses semiconductor chip can be made of the same process or different process. For example, the semiconductor chip can be a CPU, SDRAM, DRAM, etc. (see col. 6 lines 60-67 and col. 7 lines 1-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the CPU and SDRAM chips with Hsu since the combination of the CPU and the SDRAM would increase input and output signal counts of the integrated product and reduce the IC power consumption as taught by Wenzel.

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2827

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. It is cited primarily to show processes of packaging a semiconductor device, which are similar to the process of the instant invention.

Any inquiry concerning the communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alonzo Chambliss whose telephone number is (703) 306-9143. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7722 or 7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-7956.

AC

AC/March 27, 2002

  
DAVID L. TALBOTT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT ~~2827~~  
2827